

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,555	04/02/2004	George Alan Vaughan	2001U004.US-CON	4892
7590 10/04/2005		EXAMINER		
Univation Technologies, LLC			RABAGO, ROBERTO	
Suite 1950 5555 San Felipe			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77056			1713	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/817,555	VAUGHAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Roberto Rábago	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ju	ly 2005.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10,12,13 and 15</u> is/are pending in th	e application.	•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,6-10,13 and 15</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-5 and 12</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	·				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	or the certified copies not receive	0.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-102)				
Patent and Trademark Office						

DETAILED ACTION

1. Prior rejections under 35 USC 112 are withdrawn in view of amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim is indefinite because it depends from a cancelled claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 6-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Follestad et al. (WO00/50466).

The reference discloses copolymerization comprising two metallocene catalysts, resulting in a bimodal polymer composition (Examples 1 and 2), further disclosing gas phase methods (pg. 17, lines 1-15) and films (pg. 19, col. 34-37). Missing from the cited disclosure is a polymer product within the claimed density. However, the reference

Page 3

specifically states that the comonomer content of the products obtained by the disclosed method may be varied to meet the end use requirements (such as those disclosed at pg. 8, lines 4-10) to include those with higher amounts of comonomer, and further states that incorporation of both minor and major amounts of copolymer are within the intended scope (pg. 9, lines 23-31). Therefore, those of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the disclosed method for making polymers which include larger amounts of comonomer than those shown in the examples, such increased comonomer contents necessarily resulting in decreased density, including densities within the claimed range. The claimed Mw/Mn and I₂ would be included in such embodiments because applicants have claimed virtually the entire range of conventional values for such copolymers. The reference has not conducted the comparison with the zirconocene as recited in the claims; however, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily conclude that the comonomer incorporation of the bulky metallocene exemplified in the cited reference examples would be significantly decreased in view of its increased steric bulk. Regarding claim 2, the reference has also not measured the ligand angle: however, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily conclude that the angle would exceed 30 degrees to avoid excessive steric crowding of the indenyl C₆ and phenyl rings. The burden of proof is shifted to applicants to show that the exemplified metallocenes fail to include the claimed comonomer activity and ligand angle.

Application/Control Number: 10/817,555 Page 4

Art Unit: 1713

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-5 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberto Rábago Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1713

RR September 30, 2005